REMARKS

Claims 1, 35, 42, 49, 61 and 68 are amended.

Claims 35, 49 and 68 are cancelled.

All pending claims are produced below.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Summary of Interview

On January 20, 2010, Examiner Etienne Leroux and Examiner Cindy Nguyen conducted a personal interview with Applicants' representative Robert R. Sachs and Puneet Sarna (by telephone) regarding the outstanding rejections. The arguments set forth in the interview are summarized below.

Response to Rejections Under 35 USC 102(e) and 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 31,35-56,58-75,77-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hayner. Claims 8, 57 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayner in view of Drake. Amended claim 1 recites:

A method for capturing event data associated with a plurality of different types of articles, the articles comprising article data generated by a plurality of different client applications, the method comprising:
storing a plurality of different event schemas, each event schema associated with at least one of the types of articles and defining a format for storing event data and for storing article data for at least one of the types of articles, wherein event data represents user interactions with articles and is distinct from the article data, the format comprising fields for storing the event data and fields for storing the article data;
detecting an event, the event including a user interaction with an article;
responsive to the detected event, determining an event schema associated with the type of the article; and

storing, in a data store, the associated event data that identifies the event and article data
   that identifies the article using the format defined by the determined event schema
   associated with the type of the article.

Hayner does not disclose the claimed invention. More specifically, with respect

to claim 1, Hayner does not disclose "storing a plurality of different event schemas, each

event schema associated with at least one of the types of articles and defining a format for

storing event data and for storing article data for at least one of the types of articles."

Instead, Hayner is limited to capturing and storing screen event data from a call center

operator's machine when the operator performs certain actions. Because there is only a

single type of event--a screen event—there is only a single schema for storing such data.

While Hayner does discuss different <u>events</u>, that is not the same as having different

<u>schemas</u>. Rather a single schema is used for all events.

Further, because Hayner does not cognize different types of articles, nothing in

Hayner discloses storing multiple different event schemas that define fields for storing

event data for different types of events associated with different articles and fields for

storing data about different types of articles. For example, the claimed invention allows

for indexing the event of a user creating (**an event**) an email (**a type of article**) by

indexing the **article data** for the sender and recipient addresses, date, subject line, and

body text into corresponding **fields** using one type of **event schema** specific to emails,

and separately indexing the event of a user saving (**an event**) a Word document (**a**

different type of article) by indexing the **article data** for the title, date, file location, and

size of the Word document using a **different event schema** specific to documents.

Hayner is incapable of providing such different indexing of events related to articles

since he only recognizes screen events.

The Examiner cites Hayner at [0064], [0066] and asserts that Hayner enables a user to select the events to be captured. According to the Examiner, enabling the selection of events discloses storing event schema that define the fields for storing event data. However, enabling a user to choose events at best discloses storing events to be captured but does not disclose storing event schema that define fields for storing data associated with the event.

Moreover, Hayner does not disclose storing event schema that also defines the format for storing article data. The Examiner cites Hayner at [0057] for disclosing event schema. However, the cited part at best discloses capturing information about the event like the number of times the event occurred and the time lapsed between two occurrences of the event. The cited part does not disclose a format for storing the article data for an article associated with the event.

For each of these reasons, Hayner does not disclose or suggest claim 1.

Additionally, Hayner does not disclose "responsive to the detected event, determining an event schema associated with the article" related to the detected event. The Examiner asserts that Hayner discloses determining the screen events to be logged and therefore discloses determining the event schema associated with an article related to the detected event. However, as explained above, event and event schema are not interchangeable. Event schema defines the fields for storing data associated with an event whereas the event itself does not define the fields for storing its associated data. Because event and event schema are not interchangeable terms, Hayner does not disclose "responsive to the detected event, determining an event schema associated with the article." For this reason alone, Hayner does not disclose claim 1.

Drake does not remedy the deficiencies of Hayner and the Examiner does not allege that it does.

Claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-3, 5-12 and 35-41 are therefore patentable over Hayner and Drake. Independent claims 42 and 61 include similar elements as claim 1 and therefore are patentably distinguishable over Hayner and Drake for similar reasons as claim 1. Claims 43-60 depend from claim 42 and claims 62-79 depend from claim 61. These dependent claims are also patentably distinguishable from Hayner and Drake for similar reasons as claims 1.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, the application is in condition for allowance of all claims, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
MIHAI FLORIN IONESCU, ET AL

Dated: 3/31/2010   /Robert R. Sachs/
                                          Robert R. Sachs, Reg. No. 42,120
                                          Attorney for Applicants
                                          Fenwick & West LLP
                                          Silicon Valley Center
                                          801 California Street
                                          Mountain View, CA 94041
                                          Tel.: (415) 875-2410
                                          Fax.: (650) 938-5200
                                          Email: rsachs@fenwick.com

24207/10091/DOCS/2170459.1